

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 16 2006

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Applicants have amended Claim 19 to address the substance of the Examiner's rejection and to comply with Applicant's specification. Applicants feel that the claim amendments now make the rejection of independent Claim 19 and dependent Claims 20-25 moot and therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow Claims 19-25.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Applicants have amended Claim 19 to address the substance of the Examiner's rejection and to address the subject of Applicant's claimed invention. Applicants feel that the claim amendments now make the rejection of independent Claim 19 and dependent Claims 20-25 moot and therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow Claims 19-25.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 19-25 as being unpatentable over Compton et al in view of Olson. Applicants have amended Claim 19 in an effort to clarify Applicant's preferred embodiment. Applicant's claimed invention is directed to an in vitro buccal dissolution test. Neither Compton nor Olson disclose, teach or suggest an in vitro buccal dissolution test. Applicant's specification sufficiently distinguishes buccal dissolution tests from other dissolution tests. One such difference is in the time sensitivity of the buccal cavity. Residence time for test materials are often short and a test which is capable of being performed rapidly is disclosed.

One would not look to either Compton or Olson for an in vitro buccal dissolution test because Compton and Olson both disclose dissolution tests for materials that "require a substantial time period to produce a readily measurable concentration gradient" *Olson, col. , lns. 24-28*. Applicant's invention tests the buccal cavity. The

buccal cavity functions opposite that of the test samples in Compton and Olsen in that the samples reside in the order of seconds. This is not taught in either Compton or Olson. Thus, Applicants feel that the claim amendments to clarify that the invention is an in vitro buccal dissolution test now make the rejection of independent Claim 19 and dependent Claims 20-25 moot and therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow Claims 19-25.


RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 16 2006

CONCLUSION

Applicants have provided a complete listing of the claims and remarks for the Examiner's review. Applicants believe that the pending claims, Claims 19-25, are in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees which may be required or credit for overpayment for entry of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 18-1850.

Respectfully submitted,


James G. Vouros
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,453

JGV/TMC/jls (DN A01317)
ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399
Telephone : (215) 592-2564
Facsimile : (215) 592-2682

August 16, 2006